

Remarks/Arguments

Claim Summary

Claim 7 is amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 11, and claim 11 is deleted. Claim 8 is amended to fix a minor typographical error. Claim 5 is cancelled and the allowable subject matter thereof is incorporated into independent form as new claim 12. New claims 13-16 are also added.

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 are pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the indicated allowable subject matters of dependent claims 5 and 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 1-4 and 6-10 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Perlov et al. (6,036,583) in view of Grumazescus (5,809,157). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

An aspect of the present invention is to provide a pad conditioner for wafer equipment that can move a disk holder up and down relative a polishing pad without the need of a diaphragm. The movement of the disk holder is accomplished by a linear driving device having first and second magnets. See paragraphs [0020] – [0030].

Without acquiescing to the Examiner's reasons for rejection, and even if in *arguendo* Perlov et al. discloses a disk holder, a conditioner head, and a

driving device, Grumazescus fails to disclose a first magnet connected to the disk holder and a second magnet being connected to the conditioner head opposite the first magnet.

First, Grumazescus relates to an electromagnetic liner drive used to drive a piston or diaphragm as well as a loudspeaker. Column 1, lines 6-8. The technical fields of Grumazescus and the present application are far removed, and there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Grumazescus with the teachings of Perlov et al.

Second, as described above, Grumazescus fails to disclose a first magnet connected to the disk holder and a second magnet being connected to the conditioner head opposite the first magnet. In further detail, the magnets in Grumazescus are disposed in such manner that their poles repulse each other. Column 3, lines 7-10 and column 4, lines 14-17; also see FIGS 1, 3, and 7-9. As recited in claims 1 and 7 of the present application, the disk holder moves “relative to the conditioner head by a magnetic force between the first and second magnets.” Therefore, individually or in combinations, the references fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of the present claims.

For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicant respectfully content that Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 are patentable over the Examiner’s cited references individually or in combination.

Conclusion

No other issues are remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 now present in the application are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Volentine Francos & Whitt, PLLC



Linus Y. Park
Reg. No. 45,261

Date: March 17, 2005

One Freedom Square
Suite 1260
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190
Tel. (571) 283-0720
Fax (571) 283-0740